

[This document contains the author's accepted manuscript. For the publisher's version, see the link in the header of this document.]

**Paper citation:**

Baym, N., Zhang, Y. B., Kunkel, A. D., Lin, M.-C., & Ledbetter, A. (2007). Relational quality and media use in interpersonal relationships. *New Media & Society*, 9, 735-752.

**Abstract:**

This study examined the relationship between relational quality and media use in interpersonal relationships. In addition, the impacts of other potentially important variables such as sex and relationship type of participants and their partners were explored. College student participants focused on interaction experiences with an acquaintance, friend, romantic partner, or family member. Questions addressed the sex of relational partners, how much of participants' total communication with relational partners is conducted in each of three media (i.e., face-to-face, phone, and internet), and the quality of relationships. Results indicated that participant sex and partner sex did not affect reported media use, whereas relationship type had significant effects on the extent to which face-to-face and telephone communication were used. Specifically, among the college students studied, face-to-face communication was used least with family members and the telephone was used most with family members. Relationships with acquaintances had the lowest relational quality and romantic relationships, while closer, were less satisfying than either family or friendship relationships. Same-sex relationships were perceived as more satisfying than cross-sex relationships. Finally, media use did not predict relational closeness or satisfaction. Results are discussed in light of previous research on mediated interpersonal communication and conceptualizations of the role of communication technology in one's social life are highlighted.

**Key Words:** relational quality, relational satisfaction, relational closeness, media use, relationship type, sex

**Text of paper:**

Relational Quality and Media Use in Interpersonal Relationships

Nancy K. Baym

Yan Bing Zhang

Adrianne Kunkel

Mei-Chen Lin

Andrew Ledbetter

University of Kansas

Nancy K. Baym is an associate professor in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Kansas. Yan Bing Zhang is an assistant professor, and Adrianne Kunkel is an associate professor, in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Kansas. Mei-Chen Lin is an assistant professor in the School of Communication, Kent State University. Andrew Ledbetter is a graduate student in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Kansas.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Adrianne Kunkel, Department of Communication Studies, 102 Bailey Hall, 1440 Jayhawk Blvd., University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045-7574. (Phone: 785-864-9884; FAX: 785-864-5203; Email: [adkunkel@ku.edu](mailto:adkunkel@ku.edu)).

With the proliferation of the internet and mobile telephones, communication in interpersonal relationships is increasingly mediated by technology. Questions about whether mediation enhances or detracts from relational quality are thus increasingly relevant. Although research findings have been mixed (e.g. Walther, 1996), both scholarly research and popular perception have held that computers are a nonverbally-impoverished “lean” medium (Daft & Lengel, 1984), which makes it challenging to create a sense of social presence (Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976) and convey the interpersonal cues so important to creating and maintaining emotional closeness. Accordingly, much research focuses on communication technology and its potential for changing relationships.

As reviewed below, survey research has demonstrated how common interpersonal internet use has become, and suggests that patterns of relational communication, such as who communicates with whom and how often, are changing as internet interactions are incorporated into daily relational life. A small body of survey and diary studies has tried to assess the quality of relationships mediated through the internet (e.g., Cummings, Butler, & Kraut, 2000; Parks & Floyd, 1996). Unfortunately, these studies are not directly comparable and their findings are inconsistent. The study reported here assesses the extent to which the media used to conduct specific interpersonal relationships are associated with the quality of those relationships. In contrast to previous studies, we examine media use within a broader context of factors known to affect relational quality, specifically relationship type, sex, and partner sex. This combination of variables allows us to understand the magnitude of media effects relative to other potential factors, and also to identify the most likely users of media for the purpose of enacting their relationships. This study also contributes to our understanding of other factors that may affect relational quality.

### *Potential Influences on Relational Quality*

## *Media Use*

In the last decade or so, agencies and scholars have investigated the impacts of internet and telephone use, as opposed to face-to-face communication, on various relational characteristics. For example, survey research has demonstrated that the internet is a popular interpersonal medium, and that it is changing patterns of relational communication. Email has been shown to support and maintain meaningful relationships, especially in long-distance relationships and for those wherein relational partners lacked the time to achieve face-to-face contact (Stafford, Kline, & Dimmick, 1999; Wellman & Gulia, 1999; see also Pew, 2000). A nation-wide poll by the Pew Project on the Internet and American Life (2000) found that “significant majorities of online Americans say their use of email has increased the amount of contact they have with family members and friends” (p. 20). Another national study described the internet as “a catalyst for creating and maintaining friendships and family relationships” (UCLA Center for Communication Policy, 2003). Though these surveys do not directly address relational quality, they demonstrate that email is leading to more communication in existing relationships, as well as to new relationships.

Parks and colleagues (e.g., Parks & Floyd, 1996; Parks & Roberts, 1998) surveyed people who had formed friendships through online public discussion spaces. Using scales that measure commitment in face-to-face relationships, they found that these online friendships were moderately committed. Parks and Roberts asked people to compare a relationship developed online to a specific relationship developed offline. Though offline relationships were slightly more developed and involved considerably more time spent together, there were no differences in depth and breadth of interaction between offline and online relationships.

In contrast to the generally positive assessments of these studies, Cummings et al. (2000) argued that online relationships are of a lower quality than are offline relationships. In their communication diary study, students recorded each communication episode in a brief time period and assessed how useful the medium employed was for relational maintenance (among other functions). They rated email lower than

face-to-face or telephone interactions for maintaining relationships. Participants were also asked how close the relationship was, how often they requested favors and advice from partners, and how frequently they used each medium to communicate in the relationship. Relational closeness and seeking both favors and advice were combined into an index Cummings et al. (2000) called "relational strength." The researchers found that face-to-face and telephone communication predicted "strong" relationships better than did email. Unfortunately, this focus on "strong" relationships tends to conflate intimacy with relational quality, as weak tie relationships that are not close and do not entail frequent favors and advice can be of high quality and important to the quality of life (see Albrecht & Adelman, 1987). While we must acknowledge intimate relationships, we should not over-emphasize them, or exaggerate their importance, to the extent that we exclude other relationships (Parks, 1982, 1995).

Cummings et al. (2000) conducted a second study that accessed the HomeNet project's data on new internet users (e.g., Kraut et al., 1998). Participants in this study were asked a series of questions about an "internet partner" (i.e., the person outside their household to whom they sent the most email) and a "non-internet partner" (i.e., the person outside their household with whom they had the most communication regardless of modality). They found less frequent communication and less closeness with their internet partners. Frequency of communication predicted closeness for non-internet relationships, but not for internet relationships. However, Cummings et al.'s "internet partners" conducted most of their interactions in other modalities (i.e., face-to-face and telephone) and their "non-internet" partners used the internet for nearly 20% of their interactions.

When Baym, Zhang, and Lin (2004) asked students to evaluate their most recent significant social interaction, while controlling for a variety of relationship types and media, they found that internet interactions were rated slightly lower in quality than were face-to-face conversations and telephone calls (which did not differ significantly from one another). Internet interactions were, however, rated well above the midpoints in quality. Also, the type of relationship exhibited far greater influence on interaction quality than did the medium employed for the interaction.

In sum, then, there is evidence that internet use is associated with increased communication in some friendships and families, and that relationships formed online are of relatively high quality, as are online interactions. However, there is also evidence that the internet may not be perceived as suited for relational maintenance and that its use is associated with less intimate relationships. The study reported here examines the extent to which the quality of relationships varies depending on the proportion of total relational communication that takes place online. However, as did Baym et al. (2004), we situate relational media use in the contexts of relationship type and the sexes of the relational partners.

### *Relationship Type*

Baym et al.'s (2004) finding that interpersonal interaction quality depends on relationship type warrants the continued consideration of this variable in interpersonal communication research, as also suggested by Duck, Rutt, Hurst, and Strejc (1991). Among the types of relationships differentiated in examinations of interaction (Knapp, Ellis, & Williams, 1980) are those involving family members, friends, romantic partners, co-workers/acquaintances, and strangers (Rands & Levinger, 1979). Different types of relationships invoke different rules of communication, normative expectations of interaction, and levels of relational satisfaction (Argyle & Henderson, 1985; Baxter, 1986; Berger, Weber, Munley, & Dixon, 1977). Berscheid, Snyder, and Omoto (1989) operationalized frequency of contact, diversity of activities, and strength of influence as direct measures of relational closeness. Berscheid et al. found that romantic relationships were closer than both family relationships and friendships and that family relationships did not differ significantly from friendships. Other studies have shown that friends are more likely to use the internet with one another than are family members (Chen, Boase, & Wellman, 2002; Dimmick, Kline, & Stafford, 2000; Wellman & Gulia, 1999). Thus, differences in relational quality may be associated with relationship type as well as with media use.

### *Sex of Relational Partners*

Sex and partner sex are also important potential influences on relational quality that should be included when examining effects of media use. Some research detects tendencies of men and women to exhibit small behavioral differences in how they understand and evaluate their personal relationships. Specifically, women tend to be more nurturant and relationship-focused, while men tend to be more instrumental and project-focused (see the reviews by Aries, 1996; Reis, 1998; Winstead, 1986). Other research finds that women tend to value their close relationships more than men do (Aukett, Ritchie, & Mill, 1988; Duck & Wright, 1993). In addition, women have been found to be more accurate receivers (Hall, 1998; Rosenthal, Hall, Dimatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979) and senders (Buck, Miller, & Caul, 1974; Hall, 1984) of nonverbal communication messages. Importantly, however, there is a growing literature in the fields of communication and personal relationships suggesting that when both within- and between-sex comparisons are made, sex similarities are as important—if not more important—than the differences between sexes (see Aries, 1996; Canary & Hause, 1993; Duck & Wright, 1993; Kunkel & Burleson, 1998, 1999).

Relational quality may also be influenced by one's partner's sex, especially in friendships, although not in obvious ways. Given the relational focus women may exhibit, relationships with women may be perceived as of higher quality than those with men, regardless of one's own sex. Relational quality may also depend on whether a relationship is same-sex or cross-sex, especially in friendships. Research comparing same- versus cross-sex friendships suggests that, though cross-sex friendships may be more challenging (Monsour, Harris, Kurzweil, & Beard, 1994; O'Meara, 1989; Werking, 1997), they offer distinct rewards. Arnold's (1995) study of participants' narratives revealed that cross-sex friendships constantly present the difficulties that accompany jealousy, sexual tension, communication differences, and the struggle to control outside judgment of the relationship. Same-sex friendships do not provoke such questions or manifest the sexual tension of cross-sex friendships (Egland, Spitzberg, & Zormeier, 1996; Rawlins, 1992; Werking).

Despite the difficulties reported in cross-sex friendships, however, there are benefits to such alliances. For instance, some research suggests that men seek out cross-sex friendships with women as an emotional outlet (Aukett et al., 1988; Buhrke & Fuqua, 1987). Thus, cross-sex friendships may be more satisfying for males than for females because of their higher levels of intimacy, self-disclosure, and trust (Duck et al., 1991; Reis, 1998). Finally, some research suggests that both men and women see advantages to cross-sex friendships because they can gain insights about members of the opposite sex (the “romance advisor” phenomenon) (Canary & Emmers-Sommer, 1997).

Same-sex friendships may offer benefits besides ease of maintenance (Arnold, 1995). Research finds that men's same-sex friendships offer opportunities for the pursuit of desirable activities (Aukett et al., 1988; Mazur & Olver, 1987; Strikwerda & May, 1992). In contrast, women's friendships with other women tend to be characterized by high levels of emotional intimacy, personal self-disclosure, and social support (Arliss & Borisoff, 1993; Bruess & Pearson, 1996; O'Connor, 1992). Though little research comparing cross-sex and same-sex relationships within the context of internet communication exists, Parks and Roberts (1998) found that cross-sex friendships were more likely to develop in online groups than in face-to-face contexts.

Sex also seems to influence perceptions and use of the internet for relational communication. Generally, women have been shown to be more likely than men to use the internet for relational communication (Boneva & Kraut, 2002; Parks & Floyd, 1996; Pew, 2000, 2002). Data from the Pew Internet and American Life surveys (2000, 2002) demonstrate that women are more likely than men to email friends or family daily, to anticipate emails, and to communicate weighty subject matter online. Women often assume the role of maintaining long-distance contact with family via email (Boneva, Kraut, & Frohlich, 2001) and have a stronger sense of online connection with kin than do men (Chen et al., 2002).

### *Research Questions*



In short, it is important to situate the use of media to conduct relationships within the contexts of sex, partner sex, and relationship type. One goal of this study is to explore further the extent to which different media are used across relationships in accordance with these variables. It is also likely that relational quality is associated with each of these variables in some way, particularly with regard to sex. Furthermore, there could well be interaction effects among these variables so that, for instance, the quality of friendships between women who use the internet for many of their interactions could differ from the quality of relationships between male family members who do the same. Given the review of literature and our identification of potentially important factors, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1: Does the extent to which a medium is used (i.e., face-to-face, telephone, and internet communication) to conduct relationships vary depending on the sex of the participants, the sex of their partners, and their relationship types (i.e., acquaintance, friend, romantic relationship, family)?

RQ2: Does the perceived level of *relational quality* (i.e., relational satisfaction and relational closeness) vary depending on the sex of the participants, the sex of their partners, and their relationship types (i.e., acquaintance, friend, romantic relationship, family)?

RQ3: When the sex of the participants, the sex of their partners, and their relationship types are controlled for, does the extent to which a medium is used (i.e., face-to-face, telephone, or internet interaction) to conduct relationships predict the perceived *relational quality* (i.e., relational satisfaction and relational closeness) of those relationships?

## Method

### *Participants*

In order to fulfill a research requirement or to receive extra credit, 496 college students ( $M$  age = 20.67,  $SD = 1.63$ ) were recruited from Communication Studies courses at a large, residential Midwestern

university. In order to participate in the study, each participant had to meet the minimal criterion of identifying himself or herself as someone who “socializes over the internet.” Among the 496 participants, there were 40.9% ( $n = 203$ ) males and 59.1% ( $n = 293$ ) females. The majority of the participants identified themselves as White ( $n = 424$ ), 24 as Asian/Pacific Islanders, 20 as African American, 11 as Hispanic/Mexican Americans, 4 as Native American, and 13 as “other.” Participants reported an average of 7.37 years of experience in using computers ( $SD = 2.81$ ), and 5.33 years of experience using the internet ( $SD = 1.72$ ).

### *Materials and Procedures*

Participants were asked to answer questions about their interaction experiences with a partner with whom they had recently interacted. We controlled for relationship type (four types: acquaintances, friends, romantic partners, and family members) and the medium of the interaction (three types: face-to-face, phone, and internet). Thus, there were 12 versions of the survey; participants were randomly assigned to one of the versions (e.g., a face-to-face interaction with a friend, a phone conversation with a family member, an internet interaction with a romantic partner). This design facilitated randomization in participants' selection of interaction partner. One hundred and twenty-five participants (25.2%) reported on an acquaintance, 122 (24.6%) on a friend, 126 (25.4%) on a romantic partner, and 123 (24.8%) on a family member. Participants also reported the sex of this partner.

One of the major variables in this study was participants' total communication with this partner through three media (i.e., face-to-face, phone, and internet). This variable was assessed with the question, “Please estimate the percentage of your total interactions with this person that are conducted in each of the following ways in general.” Participants answered this question by providing a number, in percentage format (range 0%-100%), for each medium. This allowed us to assess the overall distribution of media use within relationships that may use multiple media. We regard these estimates to be *relatively* accurate, so that those who estimated higher proportions of internet use within relationships probably do use the

internet more within those relationships than those who estimated a lower percentage of internet communication in their relationships. In some cases, participants over-estimated the proportion of these three media so that their combined percentages totaled more than 100%. Since this seemed to indicate misunderstanding of the question, these surveys were excluded ( $n = 88$ ). Thus, the sample was reduced to 408 for the relevant analyses (i.e., those pertaining to research questions 1 and 3).

Participants were asked to evaluate the quality of their relationships on two dimensions: relational satisfaction and relational closeness. The relational satisfaction dimension was measured on a semantic differential scale of 1 to 5, whereby participants were asked to indicate the “extent to which this relationship is generally”... “Dissatisfying” (1) to “Satisfying” (5). Relational closeness with the partner was also measured using a semantic differential scale of 1 to 5, whereby participants were asked to indicate the “extent to which this relationship is generally”... “Distant” (1) to “Close” (5). Results indicated that the relational satisfaction item and the relational closeness item were not highly correlated ( $r = .67$ ) suggesting that these two items may assess different aspects of quality of relationship. Therefore, these two items were treated as two separate variables in the analysis.

## Results

### *Research Question 1*

The first research question examined whether the extent to which a medium is used to conduct relationships varied depending on the sex of the participants, the sex of their partners, and their relationship types. A 2 (participant sex) x 2 (partner sex) x 4 (relationship type) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with the three media use estimates (proportions) as the dependent measures. Results revealed a significant multivariate main effect for relationship type,  $F(9, 942) = 4.78$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .04$ , and a significant participant sex by relationship type interaction effect,  $F(9, 942) = 2.03$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta^2 = .02$ . There were no significant main effects detected for participant sex and partner sex. Univariate analyses of variances (ANOVA) on each dependent variable were conducted as follow-up tests

to the MANOVA. Using the Bonferroni method, each ANOVA was tested at the .017 level ( $.05/3 = .017$ ) (Green & Salkind, 2003).

Univariate tests showed that the relationship type main effect was significant for face-to-face [ $F(3, 389) = 4.24, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$ ] and telephone conversations [ $F(3, 389) = 10.54, p < .001, \eta^2 = .08$ ], but was not significant for internet interaction. A Tukey post hoc test revealed that participants reported a significantly lower proportion of face-to-face interaction with their family members than with their friends, romantic partners, and acquaintances (see Table 1). Results also showed that participants reported a significantly higher proportion of telephone interaction with their family members than with their friends, romantic partners, and acquaintances (see Table 1).

To decompose and interpret the significant two-way interaction between participant sex and relationship type, a series of ANOVAs was conducted. Each of these was performed to determine the effect of one of the variables tested within each level of the other (moderator) variable. Using the Bonferroni method, each ANOVA was tested at the .003 level ( $.017/6 = .003$ ) (Green & Salkind, 2003). Although the two-way sex by relationship type interaction was significant, the univariate tests did not reveal any significant results, hence the interaction effect was not pursued further.

### *Research Question 2*

Research question 2 examined whether the perceived level of relational quality (i.e., relational satisfaction and relational closeness) varied depending on the sex of the participants, the sex of their partners, and their relationship types (i.e., acquaintance, friend, romantic relationship, and family). A 2 (participant sex) x 2 (partner sex) x 4 (relationship type) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with the two relational quality measures (satisfaction and closeness) as the dependent measures. Results revealed a significant multivariate main effect for relationship type,  $F(6, 932) = 16.09, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09$ , a significant two-way participant sex by partner sex interaction effect,  $F(2, 466) = 4.90, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$ , and a three-way significant interaction between participant sex, partner sex, and

relationship type,  $F(6, 932) = 2.59, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$ . There were no other significant multivariate effects. Univariate analyses of variances (ANOVA) on each dependent variable were conducted as follow-up tests to each of the three significant MANOVA effects. Using the Bonferroni method, each ANOVA was tested at the .025 level ( $.05/2 = .025$ ) (Green & Salkind, 2003).

Univariate tests showed that the relationship type main effect was significant for relational satisfaction,  $F(3, 467) = 19.85, p < .001, \eta^2 = .11$ , and closeness,  $F(3, 467) = 28.46, p < .001, \eta^2 = .16$ . A Tukey post hoc test revealed that acquaintance relationships ( $M = 3.66$ ) were reported as less satisfying than friend ( $M = 4.30$ ), romantic ( $M = 4.27$ ), and family ( $M = 4.47$ ) relationships. Results also indicated that friend ( $M = 4.30$ ) and family ( $M = 4.47$ ) relationships were reported as more satisfying than romantic relationships ( $M = 4.27$ ). In addition, a Tukey post hoc test revealed that acquaintance relationships ( $M = 2.58$ ) were reported as less close than friend ( $M = 3.52$ ), romantic ( $M = 3.79$ ), and family ( $M = 3.66$ ) relationships. Results also indicated that romantic relationships ( $M = 3.79$ ) were reported as more close than friend relationships ( $M = 3.52$ ).

Univariate tests also showed that the significant two-way interaction between participant sex and partner sex was significant for relational satisfaction,  $F(1, 467) = 6.28, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$ , but not for relational closeness,  $F(1, 467) = .49, p > .05, \eta^2 = .00$ . In addition, although the three-way interaction between participant sex, partner sex, and relationship type was significant, the univariate tests did not reveal any significant results, hence the three-way interaction effect was not pursued further.

To decompose and interpret the significant two-way interaction between participant sex and partner sex on relational satisfaction, two ANOVAs were conducted. Each of these was performed to determine the effect of one of the variables tested within each level of the other (moderator) variable. Using the Bonferroni method, each ANOVA was tested at the .0125 level ( $.025/2 = .0125$ ) (Green & Salkind, 2003). Partner sex was thus determined to have a significant main effect on male participants,  $F(1, 199) = 6.88, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$ , so that relational satisfaction was greater with male partners ( $M = 4.26$ )

than with female partners ( $M = 3.91$ ). Partner sex was also determined to have a significant main effect on female participants,  $F(1, 289) = 7.11, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$ , so that relational satisfaction was greater with female partners ( $M = 4.34$ ) than with male partners ( $M = 4.06$ ). Though participant sex was not significant on relational satisfaction with male partners, participant sex was determined to have a significant main effect on relational satisfaction with female partners,  $F(1, 272) = 16.15, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$ , so that female participants were more satisfied ( $M = 4.34$ ) in their relationships with women than were male participants ( $M = 3.91$ ).

### *Research Question 3*

The third research question examined the extent to which a medium is used to conduct relationships (predictor variables: face-to-face, telephone, and internet) predicts the perceived relational quality (criterion measures: relational satisfaction and relational closeness) when the demographic variables (participant sex, partner sex, and relationship type) are controlled. Two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted on each of the two criterion measures of relational quality. Demographic variables were dummy coded and entered in the first stage (model 1), followed by three predictor variables (entered simultaneously in model 2<sup>1</sup>) for predicting each criterion variable. The set of demographic variables significantly predicted variance in relational satisfaction [ $R = .39$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .14$ ,  $F(5, 397) = 13.81, p < .001$ ] and relational closeness [ $R = .49$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .23$ ,  $F(5, 394) = 25.13, p < .001$ ]. We focus this analysis on the results in model 2, therefore the effects of the individual predictors in model 1 are not reported here.

When the effects of demographic variables were controlled for, the three media use variables did not predict significant variance in relational satisfaction [ $R^2$  change = .01,  $F$  change (3, 394) = 1.91,  $p > .05$ ; face-to-face,  $t = 1.27, \beta = .13, pr^2 = 00, p > .05$ ; telephone,  $t = .63, \beta = .05, pr^2 = 00, p > .05$ ; and internet,  $t = -.04, \beta = .00, pr^2 = 00, p > .05$ ] and relational closeness [ $R^2$  change = .01,  $F$  change (3, 391) = 2.41,  $p > .05$ ; face-to-face,  $t = 1.44, \beta = .14, pr^2 = 00, p > .05$ ; telephone,  $t = .90, \beta = .07, pr^2 = 00, p > .05$ ;

and internet,  $t = -.05, \beta = .00, pr^2 = .00, p > .05$ ]. In other words, participants' estimated proportion of face-to-face, telephone, and internet communication with their partners did not affect relational quality.

## Discussion

We proposed three research questions to examine the relationships among three sets of variables: the sexes and relationship types of participants and their relational partners, their media use, and their relational quality. Our first research question asked whether participant sex, partner sex, and relationship type were associated with the extent to which face-to-face, telephone, and internet communication were used relative to one another. We found that the sex of neither the participants nor their partners was associated with relational media use. In other words, women did not differ from men in the *proportion* of their relational communication they conducted online relative to face-to-face and telephone interaction. This would seem to contradict other studies' findings that women were more likely than men to use the internet for relational communication (Boneva & Kraut, 2002; Pew, 2000). One explanation may be that college students are fairly homogeneous regarding availability of media, financial situation, and lifestyle, so differences that might appear in other populations may not appear in this one. If the sample were drawn from a middle-aged population, for example, where there is a wider range of employment status and lifestyle between women and men than college students (Rosenthal, 1985), this finding may have differed.

In the replication of this and similar studies, researchers should consider carefully whether to tap frequency of communication conducted online, proportion of communication conducted online, or both. Our findings suggest that, at least among the college students that we surveyed, women and men do not differ in how they distribute their relational communication across media. It may be that the reason women use the internet more for relational communication than men is that women engage in more relational communication across all media. According to Boneva and Kraut, "the different role obligations men and women have in personal relationship maintenance and the different value they place

on personal relationships may account for these differences in email use" (p. 397). In other words, if women are more likely to engage in relational communication in the first place, then what appears to be an internet-related finding may actually be a finding about sex and relational communication that holds across media. Of course, our findings regarding the lack of sex differences in media use may differ from other studies for methodological reasons. Both Boneva and Kraut (2002) and the Pew study (2000) examined differences in the *frequency* of relational communication conducted online. In contrast, our method assessed the *proportion* of relational communication.

Relationship type had significant effects on the extent that face-to-face and telephone communication were used, but relationship type was not associated with the proportion of internet communication in a relationship. Face-to-face communication was used least with family members and the telephone was used most with family members. This likely reflects the fact that many college students are proximally separated from their families. That the proportion of internet use did not vary among relationship types is an intriguing contrast to other studies that found that friends are more likely to use the internet to communicate than are family members (Chen et al., 2002; Quan-Haase, Wellman, Witte, & Hampton, 2002). This may be due to differences in populations, as other studies utilized large diverse international samples, but also suggests a need for research across populations regarding the extent to which the internet is used in different relationship types.

Our second research question examined whether relational quality (i.e., relational satisfaction and relational closeness) depended upon participant sex, partner sex, and relationship type. Not surprisingly, for all participants and across the sex/partner sex combinations, relationships with acquaintances were found to have the lowest relational quality. This result is consistent with Baym et al. (2004) who found that interactions with acquaintances were perceived as lower in quality than those with friends, romantic partners, and family members.



Analyses addressing the second research question portrayed a complex picture regarding the quality of romantic relationships. Romantic relationships were perceived to be closer than friendships. Likewise, Berscheid et al. (1989) found that romantic relationships were closer than both family relationships and friendships. On the other hand, in the current study, romantic relationships were perceived to be less satisfying than both friendships and family relationships. It may be the case that, as the closest type of relationship partners, the romantic tend to be more attached (Steinberg, 1986, 1987) and to invest more time, emotional energy, and commitment to developing and maintaining their relationships. Hence, romantic partners may have higher expectations with regard to the quality of these relationships. Indeed, friends, for instance, are less concerned with issues related to investment than are romantic partners (Monsour, Harvey, & Betty, 1997). Consequently, a satisfying romantic relationship may be more difficult to achieve.

In regard to sex, we found that same-sex relationships were perceived as more satisfying than cross-sex relationships, across all relationship types (i.e., acquaintance, friend, romance, and family). We also found an absence of significant findings contrasting the quality of men's versus women's relationships or relationships with men versus with women. Indeed, these findings align with the inherent challenges posed by cross-sex relationships, especially cross-sex friendships (e.g., Monsour et al., 1994; Werking, 1997). Moreover, as stated previously, men may find relationships with other men to be more satisfying as they provide desired activity partners (e.g., Aukett et al., 1988; Mazur & Olver, 1987), whereas women may find relationships with other women to be more satisfying as they feature high levels of emotional intimacy, self-disclosure, and support (e.g., Arliss & Borisoff, 1993; Bruess & Pearson, 1996). Our results are consistent with some of the work on homophily which looks at the tendency of people in groups and organizations to form friendships with others who are similar (in characteristics such as sex, ethnicity, and education; see McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Interestingly, however, the finding that men and women were more satisfied with their same-sex relationships is mildly surprising as many studies find that, in times of emotional stress, both

men and women prefer women as conversational partners (Kunkel & Burleson, 1999; MacGeorge, Graves, Feng, Gillihan, & Burleson, 2004; Reis, Senchak, & Solomon, 1985). Of course, in this study, we investigated more general forms of relationship quality.

Our third research question asked whether there is an association between the extent to which a medium is used to conduct a relationship and the quality of that relationship, when one controls for the factors of relationship type (which we have shown to be associated with relational quality) and sex/partner sex (which are associated with quality in this study). However, the proportion of face-to-face, telephone, and internet communication in a relationship did not predict relational quality. This suggests that mediation neither improves, nor detracts from, relational satisfaction and closeness. These findings are inconsistent with Cummings et al. (2000) who found that online relationships are of a lower quality than are offline relationships. Overall, our findings demonstrate that the extent to which a relationship is conducted online or by telephone may have little to do with the quality of that relationship. Hence, rather than replacing, revolutionizing, or reversing the impacts of other interpersonal communication modes, communication technologies may be appropriated to supplement these means of meeting the goals of personal relationships (Katz & Rice, 2002; Kavanaugh & Patterson, 2002). In general, our study demonstrates the importance of contextualizing communication technologies vis-à-vis more traditional means of accomplishing the same ends.

In closing, we note the difficulty of comparing studies that examine different aspects of the relational context and that implement varied measures of them. The resulting differences in findings give rise to a wide range of interpretations. As we begin to make sense of the role of mediation in interpersonal communication, we will be wise to explain our measures clearly, to corroborate the findings of others, and, perhaps most importantly, to refrain from overgeneralization. For instance, samples of American college students enrolled in Communication Studies courses may be somewhat atypical of the American, and global, population. Moreover, while our focus on proportion of

communication rather than frequency or amount of communication creates more specific comprehension, it also complicates comparison with the findings of other researchers. We thus remain a long way from either broad or fully refined understandings of how mediation affects interpersonal relationships, or how specific features of relationships may impact the use of particular communication modalities. Our hope is that future research attends to these concerns by implementing multiple measures of media use and various methodological approaches (e.g., interviews, participant observation) to study diverse populations. Thus, we may come to better understand how mediation shapes our relational experiences.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>We also conducted regression analyses by entering each of the three media use variables separately in the second model for concerns of *multicollinearity* among the variables. Patterns of results remained the same as when the three media use variables were entered simultaneously in the same model. In addition, the *Tolerance* indices were good (varying from .93 to .97; Cohen, 2001); hence, we reported the regression results containing the three media use variables in the same model.

## References

- Albrecht, T. L. and Adelman, M. B. (1987) 'Dilemmas of Supportive Communication', in T. L. Albrecht and M. B. Adelman (eds.) *Communicating Social Support*, pp. 240-254. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Argyle, M. and Henderson, M. (1985) *The Anatomy of Relationships*. London: Heinemann.
- Aries, E. (1996) *Men and Women in interaction: Reconsidering the Differences*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arliss, L. and Borisoff, D. (1993) *Women and Men Communicating: Challenges and Changes*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Arnold, L. B. (1995) 'Through the Narrow Pass: Experiencing Same-Sex Friendship in Heterosexual(ist) Settings', *Communication Studies* 46: 234.
- Aukett, R., Ritchie, J. and Mill, K. (1988) 'Gender Differences in Friendship Patterns', *Sex Roles* 19: 57-66.
- Baxter, L. A. (1986) 'Gender Differences in Heterosexual Relationship Rules Embedded in Break-Up Accounts', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 3: 289-306.
- Baym, N., Zhang, Y. B. and Lin, M. C. (2004) 'Social Interaction Across Media: Interpersonal Communication on the Internet, Face-to-Face, and Telephone', *New Media & Society* 6: 41-60.
- Berger, C. R., Weber, M. D., Munley, M. E. and Dixon, J. T. (1977) 'Interpersonal Relationship Levels and Interpersonal Attraction', in B. D. Rubin (ed.) *Communication Yearbook 1*, pp. 245-261. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

- Berscheid, E., Snyder, M. and Omoto, A. M. (1989) 'The Relationship Closeness Inventory: Assessing the Closeness of Interpersonal Relationships', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57: 792-807.
- Boneva, B. and Kraut, R. (2002) 'Email, Gender, and Personal Relationships', in B. Wellman and C. Haythornthwaite (eds.) *The Internet in Everyday Life*, pp. 404-430. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Boneva, B., Kraut, R. and Frohlich, D. (2001) 'Using E-mail for Personal Relationships: The Difference Gender Makes', *American Behavioral Scientist* 45: 530-549.
- Bruess, C. J. S. and Pearson, J. C. (1996) 'Gendered Patterns in Family Communication', in J. Wood (ed.) *Gendered Relationships*, pp. 59-78. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Buck, R., Miller, R. E. and Caul, W. F. (1974) 'Sex, Personality, and Physiological Variables in the Communication of Emotion Via Facial Expression', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 30: 587-596.
- Buhrke, R. A. and Fuqua, D. R. (1987) 'Sex Differences in Same- and Cross-Sex Supportive Relationships', *Sex Roles* 17: 339-352.
- Canary, D. J. and Emmers-Sommer, T. M. (1997) *Sex and Gender Differences in Personal Relationships*. New York: Guilford.
- Canary, D. J. and Hause, K. S. (1993) 'Is There Any Reason to Research Sex Differences in Communication?', *Communication Quarterly* 41: 129-144.
- Chen, W., Boase, J. and Wellman, B. (2002) 'The Global Villagers: Comparing Internet Users and Uses Around the World', in B. Wellman and C. Haythornthwaite (eds.), *The Internet in Everyday Life*, pp. 74-113. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cohen, B. H. (2001) *Explaining Psychological Statistics* (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Cummings, J., Butler, B. and Kraut, R. (2000) 'The Quality of Online Social Relationships', *Communications of the ACM* 45: 103-108.

Daft, R. L. and Lengel, R. H. (1984) 'Information Richness: A New Approach to Managerial Behavior and Organizational Design', *Research in Organizational Behavior* 6: 191-233.

Dimmick, J., Kline, S. L. and Stafford, L. (2000) 'The Gratification Niches of Personal Email and the Telephone: Competition, Displacement, and Complementarity', *Communication Research* 27: 227-248.

Duck, S., Rutt, D. J., Hurst, M. H. and Strejc, H. (1991) 'Some Evident Truths About Conversations in Everyday Relationships', *Human Communication Research* 18: 228-267.

Duck, S. and Wright, P. H. (1993) 'Reexamining Gender Differences in Friendships: A Close Look at Two Kinds of Data', *Sex Roles* 28: 709-727.

Egland, K. L., Spitzberg, B. H. and Zormeier, M. M. (1996) 'Flirtation and Conversational Competence in Cross-Sex Platonic and Romantic Relationships', *Communication Reports* 9: 105-115.

Green, S. B. and Salkind, N. J. (2003) *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and Understanding Data* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, J. A. (1984) *Nonverbal Sex Differences: Communication, Accuracy, and Expressive Styles*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hall, J. A. (1998) 'How Big Are Nonverbal Sex Differences? The Case of Smiling and Sensitivity to Nonverbal Cues', in D. Canary and K. Dindia (eds.), *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication*, pp. 155-177. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Katz, J. E. and Rice, R. E. (2002) *Social Consequences of Internet Use: Access, Involvement, and Interaction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

- Kavanaugh, A. L. and Patterson, S. J. (2002) 'The Impact of Community Computer Networks on Social Capital and Community Involvement in Blacksburg', in B. Wellman and C. Haythornthwaite (eds.), *The Internet in Everyday Life*, pp. 325-344. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Knapp, M. L., Ellis, D. G. and Williams, B. A. (1980) 'Perceptions of Communication Behavior Associated with Relationships Terms', *Communication Monographs* 47: 262-278.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukhopadhyay, T. and Scherlis, W. (1998) 'Internet Paradox: A Social Technology that Reduces Social Involvement and Psychological Well-Being?', *American Psychologist* 53: 1017-1031.
- Kunkel, A. W. and Burleson, B. R. (1998) 'Social Support and the Emotional Lives of Men and Women: An Assessment of the Different Cultures Perspective', in D. Canary and K. Dindia (eds.), *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication*, pp. 101-125. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kunkel, A. W. and Burleson, B. R. (1999) 'Assessing Explanations for Sex Differences in Emotional Support: A Test of the Different Cultures and Skill Specialization Accounts', *Human Communication Research* 25: 307-340.
- MacGeorge, E. L., Graves, A. R., Feng, B., Gillihan, S. J. and Burleson, B. R. (2004) 'The Myth of Gender Cultures: Similarities Outweigh Differences in Men's and Women's Provision of and Responses to Supportive Communication', *Sex Roles* 50: 143-175.
- Mazur, E. and Olver, R. R. (1987) 'Intimacy and Structure: Sex Differences in Imagery of Same-Sex Friendships', *Sex Roles* 16: 539-558.
- McPherson, J. M. and Smith-Lovin, L. (1987) 'Homophily in Voluntary Organizations: Status Distance and the Composition of Face-to-Face Groups', *American Sociological Review* 52: 320-379.



McPherson, J. M., Smith-Lovin, L. and Cook, J. M. (2001) 'Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks', *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 415-444.

Monsour, M., Harris, B., Kurzweil, N. and Beard, C. (1994) 'Challenges Confronting Cross-Sex Friendships: "Much Ado about Nothing?,"' *Sex Roles* 31: 55-77.

Monsour, M., Harvey, V. and Betty, S. (1997) 'A Balance Theory Explanation of Challenges Confronting Cross-Sex Friendships', *Sex Roles* 37: 825-845.

O' Connor, P. (1992) *Friendships Between Women: A Critical Review*. New York: Guilford.

O'Meara, J. D. (1989) 'Cross-Sex Friendship: Four Basic Challenges of An Ignored Relationship', *Sex Roles* 21: 525-543.

Parks, M. R. (1982) 'Ideology in Interpersonal Communication: Off the Couch and Into the World', in M. Burgoon (ed.), *Communication Yearbook 5*, pp. 79-108. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Parks, M. R. (1995) 'Ideology in Interpersonal Communication: Beyond the Couches, Talkshows, and Bunkers', in B. R. Burleson (ed.), *Communication Yearbook 18*, pp. 480-497. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Parks, M. R. and Floyd, K. (1996) 'Making Friends in Cyberspace', *Journal of Communication* 46: 80-97.

Parks, M. R. and Roberts, L. D. (1998) 'Making MOOsic': The Development of Personal Relationships On Line and A Comparison to Their Offline Counterparts', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 15: 517-537.

Pew Internet Project. (2000, May 10) *Tracking Online Life: How Women Use the Internet to Cultivate Relationships with Family and Friends*. Washington D.C. Available: Internet <http://pewinternet.org/reports/index.asp>

Pew Internet Project (2002, May 10) *The Internet Goes to College: How Students Are Living in the Future with Today's Technology*. Available: Internet

<http://www.pewinternet.org/reports/index.asp>

Quan-Haase, A., Wellman, B., Witte, J. and Hampton K. N. (2002) 'Capitalizing on the Net: Social Contact, Civic Engagement, and Sense of Community', in B. Wellman and C. Haythornthwaite (eds.), *The Internet in Everyday Life*, pp. 291-324. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Parks, M. R. and Roberts, L. D. (1998) 'Making MOOsic': The Development of Personal Relationships On Line and A Comparison to Their Offline Counterparts', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 15: 517-537.

Rands, M. and Levinger, G. (1979) 'Implicit Theories of Relationship: An Intergenerational Study', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37: 645-661.

Rawlins, W. K. (1992) *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics, and the Life Course*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Reis, H. T. (1998) 'Gender Differences in Intimacy and Related Behaviors: Context and Process', in D. Canary and K. Dindia (eds.), *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication*, pp. 203-231. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Reis, H. T., Senchak, M. and Solomon, B. (1985) 'Sex Differences in the Intimacy of Social Interaction: Further Examination of Potential Explanations', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 48: 1204-1217.

Rosenthal, C. J. (1985) 'Kin Keeping in the Familial Division of Labor', *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 47: 965-947.

Rosenthal, R., Hall, J. A., Dimatteo, Rogers and Archer, D. (1979) *Sensitivity to Nonverbal Communication: The PONS Test*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Short, J., Williams, E. and Christie, B. (1976) *The Social Psychology of Telecommunications*.  
Chichester: Wiley.

Stafford, L., Kline, S. L. and Dimmick, J. (1999) 'Home E-Mail: Relational Maintenance and  
Gratification Opportunities', *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 43: 659-669.

Steinberg, R. J. (1986) 'A Triangular Theory of Love', *Psychological Review* 93: 119-135.

Steinberg, R. J. (1987) 'Liking Versus Loving: A Comparative Evaluation of Theories', *Psychological  
Bulletin* 102: 331-345.

Strikwerda, R. and May, L. (1992) 'Male Friendship and Intimacy', in L. May and R. Strikwerda (eds.),  
*Rethinking Masculinity: Philosophical Explorations in Light of Feminism*, pp. 95-110.  
Langhorne, MD: Rowan Littlefield.

UCLA Center for Communication Policy (2003, April 12) *Surveying the Digital Future*. Available:  
Internet <http://ccp.ucla.edu/pages/internet-report.asp>

Walther, J. (1996) 'Computer-Mediated Communication: Impersonal, Interpersonal and Hyperpersonal  
Interaction', *Communication Research* 23: 3-43.

Wellman, B. and Gulia, M. (1999) 'Virtual Communities as Communities: Net Surfers Don't  
Ride Alone', in M. Smith, and P. Kollock (eds.), *Communities in Cyberspace*, pp. 167-  
194. New York: Routledge.

Werking, K. (1997) *We're Just Good Friends: Women and Men in Nonromantic Relationships*. New  
York: Guilford.

Winstead, B. A. (1986) 'Sex Differences in Same-Sex Friendships', in V. J. Derlega and B. A. Winstead  
(eds.), *Friendship and Social Interaction*, pp. 81-99. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Table 1

*Means and Standard Deviations for Face-to-Face and Telephone Conversations by Relationship Type (n = 408).*

Media Use	Relationship Type							
	Friend		Family Member		Romantic Partner		Acquaintance	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Face-to-Face	48.99 <sup>a</sup>	31.83	35.16 <sup>b</sup>	28.27	58.56 <sup>a</sup>	29.27	49.18 <sup>a</sup>	37.91
Telephone	27.30 <sup>a</sup>	21.64	38.03 <sup>b</sup>	27.89	26.48 <sup>a</sup>	21.29	17.72 <sup>a</sup>	23.87
Internet	20.82	25.90	18.70	24.02	12.32	20.15	24.11	32.76

Note. Means with different superscripts in rows differ significantly at  $p < .017$ .